

# The *auctor monasterii* of the Byzantine monastery of Veszprém Valley 2.

Rudolf Szentgyörgyi  
Eötvös Loránd University

1. The *Renovatio* of 1109, written in Latin, reinstating the Greek nuns in their property, and preserving the content of the original Greek diploma for posterity, explained why the original document had been written in Greek as follows: “Vetus autem priuilegium *iuxta linguam* auctoris monasterii grece scriptum” – that is, ‘the old deed of gift had been written in Greek, the language of the founder of the monastery’.<sup>1</sup> In accordance with the terminology of the period, as we saw in the first part of this paper, the term “founder” (*auctor*) must have referred to the “internal”, ecclesiastic organiser of the monastery, and its superior in the ecclesiastic-legal sense.

The institution of monasticism in Eastern (Orthodox) Christianity is different in many respects from Western religious orders. This is not the place where the details are to be discussed; let us restrict ourselves to just a few statements that are directly related to our topic here:

1. In Eastern Christianity, there are no separate “orders” of the Western type. (The term *Basilite* itself is of Western origin, and its use is based on the differentiation from Western religious orders.<sup>2</sup>)

2. The Council of Chalcedon (451 AD) decided that monasteries can only be founded by permission of the local bishop, and stated that monks are under

---

<sup>1</sup> This work was supported by the János Bolyai Research Scholarship of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences and was carried out under the auspices of the Research Group on Hungarian Language History and Toponomastics (University of Debrecen – Hungarian Academy of Sciences).

<sup>2</sup> Bertalan Dudás – László Legeza – Péter Szacsavay, *Baziliták*, 1993, Budapest, Mikes Kiadó, p. 3.

the superiority of the bishop.<sup>3</sup> These decrees were reconfirmed and extended in the next century by Emperor Justinian.<sup>4</sup>

3. In the 10–11th centuries, the economic prerequisites of the life of a monastery (that the ecclesiastic hierarchy involved in its foundation did not necessarily concern itself with), as well as its defence against pilferers were provided by the institution of protectorate (ἐφορεία).<sup>5</sup> The lay protector did not have any of the rights based on the act of foundation. The institution of protectorate, giving rise to numerous instances of misuse, came to an end during the reform of the late 11th century (except, of course, for imperial protectorate); but this issue does not concern us here.

The foregoing considerations help us draw the following conclusions with respect to the monastery of Veszprém Valley:

1. The Greek nuns' monastery was founded during the existence of the institution of protectorate (10–11th centuries).

2. This Eastern monastery cannot have been founded by a lay person (a prince or a king) according to Byzantine canon law; at most, such a person could be its ἑφορος, or protector.<sup>6</sup> (That is why we cannot accept that a lay person, including the king himself, might be referred to by the term *auctor* in *Renovatio*.)

3. The Latin *Renovatio* of 1109 makes a legally precise distinction between the (Greek-speaking) *auctor* of the monastery and its protector, referring to

<sup>3</sup> Joannes Dominicus Mansi (ed.), *Sacrorum Conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio*, Tomus sextus, 1761, Florentiae, p. 1226. Cf. André Guillou – Filippo Burgarella – Alessandro Bausani, *L'Impero bizantino e l'Islamismo*, 1981, Torino, Unione Tipografico-Editrice, p. 115; Szabolcs Anzelm Szuromi, "A püspöki joghatóság és a szerzetesi közösségek a VI. századig", In: Mihály Kránitz (ed.), *Az atyák dicsérete. A 60 éves Vanyó László köszöntése*, 2002, Budapest, Szent István Társulat, p. 238.

<sup>4</sup> Novellae Iustiniani 5. c. 1., 86. c. 8. In: C. E. Zachariae a Lingenthal (ed.), *Imperatoris Iustiniani Novellae quae vocantur sive constitutiones quae extra codicem supersunt ordine chronologico digestae*, 1-2, 1881, Lipsiae, Teubner; Codex Iustinianus 1, 3, 46, In: Paulus Krueger (Krüger) (ed.), *Codex Iustinianus*, 1877, Berolini, Weidmann; cf. A. Guillou – F. Burgarella – A. Bausani, *L'Impero bizantino e l'Islamismo*, *op. cit.*, p. 115, 116; Pál Sáy, "Szerzetesek és monostorok a iustinianusi jog forrásaiban", *Iustum Aequum Salutare*, 3, 2007, p. 57-76.

<sup>5</sup> A. Guillou – F. Burgarella – A. Bausani, *L'Impero bizantino e l'Islamismo*, *op. cit.*, p. 119; John Thomas – Angela Constantinides Hero (eds.), *Byzantine monastic foundation documents. A complete translation of the surviving founders' typika and testaments* 1-5, 2000, Washington D.C., Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection, vol. 1, p. 298.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. Imre Timkó, *Keleti kereszténység, keleti egyházak*, 1971, Budapest, Szent István Társulat, p. 398; Peter Schreiner, *Bizánc. Bevezetés a Bizantinológiába*, 2002, Budapest, Bizantinológiai Intézeti Alapítvány, p. 147.

the latter, quite correctly, not by the term *fundator* but by *privilegium*, a term that is repeated several times. (The basis of the distinction is that the functions of Latin *fundator* and Greek ἑφορος are not quite identical; an issue that we do not discuss here in detail.) The two monarchs' roles are not differentiated in *Renovatio*: both the initiator of the foundation (*vetus privilegium*) and the one who reinstated the privileges (*novum privilegium*) function as protectors. The later practice of Latin diplomas also involves precise terminology with respect to Greek monasteries, see e.g. 1211: "*rex Vngariae illustris, nobis insinuare curauit, quod abbatia de Wisegrad, Wesprimiensis Diaecesis, in qua ius obtinet patronatus, Graecos habet monachos*".<sup>7</sup>

4. The act of foundation requires the participation of the local bishop (or a higher ecclesiastic dignity).

2. Thus, in the Eastern way of founding a monastery, the monarch cannot be considered to be a founder; as a protector, he has three major roles, all three of which are found in the deed of gift.

First, he has the right of postulating the demand for a monastery. (But, recall, that fact does not turn him into an actual founder.) The initiation of the foundation of a monastery stands in the most ceremonious position, preceding the *intitulatio*, at the beginning of the diploma, right after the *invocatio verbalis*: Ἐντέλλομαι 'I charge someone with something, I decree/order someone to do something, I regulate something'. The expression, as we will see, refers to the intention of foundation, and not – as would follow from the text of the available Hungarian translations<sup>8</sup> – to what is written in the mandatory paragraphs. The Biblical or liturgical tone of the expression makes it stand out of objective legal usage (that is strongly represented in the Hungarian translations).<sup>9</sup> Beyond its ceremonial and Biblical connotations,

---

<sup>7</sup> *Codex diplomaticus Hungariae ecclesiasticus ac civilis*, 1-11, Studio et opera Georgii Fejér, 1829–1844, Buda, vol. 3/1, p. 310.

<sup>8</sup> Gyula Czebe, *A veszprémvölgyi oklevél görög szövege*, Értkezések a történeti tudományok köréből, 24/3, 1916, Budapest, MTA, p. 17; Gyula Moravcsik, "Görög nyelvű monostorok Szent István korában", In: Jusztián Serédi (ed.), *Emlékkönyv Szent István király halálának kilencszázadik évfordulójára*, 1-2, 1938, Budapest, MTA, vol. 1. p. 410; Gyula Moravcsik, *Az Árpád-kori magyar történet bizánci forrásai*, István Kapitánffy – Zsigmond Ritoók (eds.), 1988<sup>2</sup>, Budapest, Akadémiai Kiadó, p. 80; György Györffy, *István király és műve*, 1983<sup>2</sup>, Budapest, Gondolat Kiadó, p. 321.

<sup>9</sup> See Rudolf Szentgyörgyi, "A veszprémvölgyi monostor görög nyelvű adománylevele – legelső hazai nyelvméltunk?", *Magyar Nyelv*, 108, 2012, p. 313-314. With respect to further Biblical allusions of the diploma, cf. Jenő Darkó, "A veszprémi apácza-monostor alapító-levelének

and primarily, the fact that the verb stands at the beginning of the main body of the text of the diploma obviously has structural reasons.

The two verbs in first person singular introduce two important structural units: Ἐντέλλομαι ‘I order (that the monastery be founded)’; Ἰ charge (someone with this task), καὶ δίδωμι (in classical spelling: δίδωμι) ‘and I donate (properties)’. The latter expression introduces the part corresponding to the second – and most important – role: catering for the economic prerequisites of monastic life. The deed of gift is principally about the latter. Along with a detailed list of properties/estates donated, the monarch also gives a further privilege: the possibility of banishing persons who do not accept the supremacy of the monastery.<sup>10</sup>

The third role of a protector is to ensure the tranquillity of the life of the monastery by all legal (and, if necessary, physical) means, against all possible ecclesiastic and non-ecclesiastic power. This is expressed by a customary formula of malediction. It is essentially that commitment of defence that, a century later, King Coloman also complies with by issuing the diploma of reinstatement.

3. After surveying the protector’s tasks, let us see those of the actual founder (using the Latin term, the *auctor*) in the process of the foundation of the Greek monastery.

As a first step, the representative of the ecclesiastic hierarchy personally blessed the location selected (that may have been selected by the donor in later times) thus sanctioning the permission to use it.<sup>11</sup> It was only after that that the monastery could be physically created and populated.

It is the founder’s task (though not to be performed by himself) to create the monastery: to gouge the monks’ cells out of the cliffs (πέτρα), to build the corridors that connect the cells (λαύρα), etc. The fact that this step was usually linked to the person of the actual founder, at least formally, is confirmed by a number of notes even with respect to the 10–11th centuries, stating that the founder “gouged the cliff by his own hands”.<sup>12</sup> In geographical

1109-i másolatáról”, *Egyetemes Philológiai Közlöny*, 41, 1917, p. 257–272, 336–351. For the connection of the diploma with liturgy, see Gábor Krajnyák, “Szent István veszprémvölgyi donatiójának görög egyházi vonatkozásai”, *Századok*, 59–60, 1925–1926, p. 498–507.

<sup>10</sup> For a detailed and convincing discussion of this philological problem, see László Holler, “Az 1109. évi veszprémvölgyi ítélettel néhány alapkérdéséről”, *Magyar Nyelv*, 108, 2012, p. 55.

<sup>11</sup> Cf. Iustinianus: Nov. 5. c. 1.

<sup>12</sup> E.g. Georgius Györffy (ed.), *Diplomata Hungariae antiquissima. Accedunt epistolae et acta*

environments where monasteries of this kind were not possible to create, buildings (μοναστήριον, μονή) were raised.

Given that, as was mentioned above, it was not a “religious order” that founded a monastery, the founder had to assemble – issuing invitations to several places, if necessary – the community of monks. This step obviously often preceded the creation of the monastery, since it was the monks themselves who finally created their homes. (As opposed to Western monasteries founded by a *fundator*, where “accommodation” was customarily created before a monastery was populated.<sup>13</sup>)

The founder directed and governed the community as its superior in the ecclesiastic-legal sense. In particular, he organised the everyday lives of the monks: he gave regulations to affect the schedule of their prayers and activities. The compiler of those regulations, however, could also be the person who practised the ecclesiastic supervision.<sup>14</sup>

It is important to note in this connection that in the case of the foundation of a nuns’ monastery, it is almost unavoidable that the document of foundation<sup>15</sup> (τυπικόν) regulating their way of life is compiled by the local bishop (metropolitan, patriarch) who often takes over all tasks related to the process of foundation. Thus, even though he is obviously not a monk of the monastery, he is the “official” founder and superior of the monastery, whose rank is above that of the *igumenia* (‘abbess’).<sup>16</sup>

4. The specific problem of the diploma of the Veszprém Valley monastery is that while we can spot the tasks of the actual founder (in addition to those of the protector), no mention is made of the person of the founder.

The tasks of the founder as given in the Veszprém Valley deed of gift are:

1. Creating the monastery: ποιοῦντα [...] μοναστήριον.
2. Populating the monastery: ἐν αὐτῷ ἀθροῦσας πλῆθος μοναζουσῶν.

---

*ad historiam Hungariae pertinentia*, 1. Ab anno 1000 usque ad annum 1196, 1992, Budapest, Akadémiai Kiadó (= DHA.), p. 282. Cf. Rudolf Szentgyörgyi, “A Tihanyi alapítólevelé görög helynevei”, *Magyar Nyelv*, 106, 2010, p. 306-307.

<sup>13</sup> Rudolf Szentgyörgyi, “Cikádor”, *Helynévtörténeti Tanulmányok*, 6, 2011, p. 8.

<sup>14</sup> Cf. e.g. J. Thomas – A. C. Hero (eds.), *Byzantine monastic foundation documents*, *op. cit.*, vol. 3, p. 960, 1107.

<sup>15</sup> For the details, see R. Szentgyörgyi, “A veszprémvölgyi monostor görög nyelvű adománylevele – legelső hazai nyelvelmélkünk?”, *art. cit.*, p. 311-312.

<sup>16</sup> Cf. e.g. J. Thomas – A. C. Hero (eds.), *Byzantine monastic foundation documents*, *op. cit.*, vol. 3, p. 954.

(The participle ἀθύρας expresses anteriority compared to the act of creation.)

3. Directing and leading the community: διοικοῦντα. (The verb διοικέω means ‘direct, govern’. The available Hungarian translations render it inaccurately: *szerveztem* ‘I organised’,<sup>17</sup> *szervezve* ‘organising’,<sup>18</sup> *felállítottam* ‘I set up’,<sup>19</sup> *fenntartva* ‘maintaining’).<sup>20</sup>

4. Regulating the schedule of prayers and life in general: καταστένοντα [read: κατασταίνοντα]. (The meaning of the verb κατασταίνω is ‘arrange, organise, sort out’. The Hungarian translations reflect this meaning more or less correctly.)

It is a grammatical problem, however, that three of the four tasks mentioned are *participium imperfectum* forms in the accusative, that is, they do not agree with the subject (ἐγῶ).

The translation of accusative participles as (Hungarian) adverbial participles (or equivalently as temporal subordinate clauses) can be a heritage of the gerundive constructions occurring in early Latin translations of this document (“Iubeo ego Stephanus [...] erigendum, administrandum, et constabiliendum Monasterium”<sup>21</sup>). On the other hand, in the Byzantine Greek of the turn of the millennium, accusative (unsuffixable) participles ending in -οντα do occur in an adverbial or predicative role.<sup>22</sup> This interpretation, employed by earlier translators for want of a better solution, is untenable in an ecclesiastic-legal and ecclesiastic-historical perspective, given that these tasks cannot be performed by a non-ecclesiastic person in the Eastern rite; in addition, this interpretation is also unlikely on grammatical (the medial form ἐντέλλομαι lacks an argument) and structural (ἐντέλλομαι ... καὶ δίδομαι ‘I order ... and I donate’) grounds, too.

Let us note in passing that the gerundive constructions of the Latin translation that antedates the Hungarian translations confirm the above

<sup>17</sup> Gy. Czebe, *A veszprémvölgyi oklevél görög szövege*, *op. cit.*, p. 17.

<sup>18</sup> Gy. Moravcsik, “Görög nyelvű monostorok Szent István korában”, *art. cit.*, p. 410.

<sup>19</sup> Gy. Moravcsik, *Az Árpád-kori magyar történet bizánci forrásai*, *op. cit.*, p. 80.

<sup>20</sup> Gy. Györffy, *István király és műve*, *op. cit.*, p. 321.

<sup>21</sup> P. Carolus Péterffy, *Sacra Concilia Ecclesiae Romano-catholicae in regno Hungariae celebrata. Ab Anno Christi MXVI. usque ad Annum MDCCXV*, Pars Prima, 1741, Posonii, Typis Haeredum Royerianorum, p. 6; cf. István Horvát, “Boldog Aszszony Veszprém Völgyi Apátza Monostorának alkató Görög Oklevele [!] Szent István Magyar Királytól Kálmán Magyar Királynak 1109-ik évi Hiteles Másolatából két Rész Táblával”, *Tudományos Gyűjtemény*, 18/1, 1834, p. 89.

<sup>22</sup> Robert Browning, *Medieval and Modern Greek*, 1983<sup>2</sup>, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, p. 64.

interpretation fully: “Iubeo ego Stephanus [...] erigendum, administrandum, et constabiliendum Monasterium Santissimae Dei Genitricis”<sup>23</sup>, that is: ‘I, Steven, ordain (...) the creation, government, and strengthening of the Monastery of the Most Holy Mother of God’.

As it is unclear in the text who the actual founder is, it became possible for earlier translations to attribute the immediate tasks of the foundation to the monarch, despite the problematic nature of grammatical agreement. Also, it was necessary to render the form of διοικέω ‘direct, govern’ as *szervez* ‘organise’, *felállít* ‘set up’, or *fenntart* ‘maintain’, since it is obvious that the monarch cannot be the governor or superior of the monastery in the ecclesiastic-legal sense. Who is the immediate agent, then? Who actually performed these actions?

5. In the textual unit preceding the *dispositio*, a single verb occurs in the role of predicate: ἐντέλλομαι ‘I order’. Its subject is ἐγὼ ‘I’<sup>24</sup> (that is, στέφανος χριστιανὸς ὁ καὶ κράλ[ης]). In addition to the usual arguments of active medial verb forms (‘I order someone to do something’: τινί τι, τινί + inf., τινὶ ἵνα + conj.) *accusativus cum infinitivo* is also expected, the verb being that of wishing. However, none of these is found in the text. Instead, unexpectedly in Classical and in Koine Greek alike, there are constructions that look like *accusativus cum participio*: ἐντέλλομαι [...] ποιῶντα καὶ διοικοῦντα καὶ καταστένοντα ‘I order (...), to create, direct and regulate’ – the object being in all three cases τῷ μοναστήριον ‘the monastery (acc.)’. The agent of the construction would also be expected to stand in the accusative, and, given that the participles are in the masculine form, the agent cannot be the abbess. The text goes on with the title of the monastery, in the genitive, of course: (τῷ μοναστήριον) τῆς ὑπεραγίας θεοτόκου ‘(the monastery) of the Most Holy Mother of God’. This is followed by two further constituents: εἰς τῷ βεσπρέμ ‘in Veszprém’, and: τοῦ μητροπολίτου. With the conjunction καὶ that follows, a new, independent construction begins.

<sup>23</sup> P. C. Péterffy, *Sacra Concilia Ecclesiae Romano-catholicae in regno Hungariae celebrata*, op. cit., p. 6; I. Horvát, “Boldog Aszszony Veszprém Völgyi Apátza Monostorának alkató Görög Öklevele...”, op. cit., p. 89.

<sup>24</sup> Quotations from the diploma will be given here (as before) according to Györfy’s edition (DHA. 85), except that I refrain from capitalization and the corrections offered by Györfy in footnotes (made in terms of the classical spelling). Abbreviations will be marked (unlike in the text edition).

At this point, we are left with two possibilities:

1. We take τοῦ μητροπολίτου to be another attribute of μοναστήριον ‘monastery’, and keep the interpretation offered by the existing translations: the attribute “expresses rank”: ‘archiepiscopal (monastery of the Mother of God)’. In this case, we have three problems: (a) there is no agent; (b) non-agreeing masculine participles in the accusative are “stranded”, and (c) finally, we are left with a grammatically uninterpretable text that still does not allow us to attribute the moments of foundation to the monarch. Or:

2. We have spotted the founder of the monastery. As we were looking for an ecclesiastic person, and the text does not refer to any other such person at the given place, this is most likely. The only problem is that this ecclesiastic person is mentioned in the genitive: τοῦ μητροπολίτου, rather than in the expected accusative: τὸν μητροπολίτην. Since the sentence remains incoherent (as witnessed by the second-best solutions found in earlier translations), we have good reason to assume that the genitive form occurring here is simply a mistake that the scribe committed in copying.

The mistaken case form can be due to a number of different reasons:

1. The agent is rather far from the participles. This is motivated both stylistically and devotionally, as the elements of the construction enclose and thus enhance the most important part of the sentence, the aim of all activities: “the monastery of the Most Holy Mother of God”. However, this did not facilitate the copier’s task: the fact that the parts of the construction occurring at a distance do belong together must have escaped his attention.

2. The agent is directly preceded in the text by the genitive construction τῆς ὑπεραγίας θεοτόκου. The preceding genitive case marker, and especially its masculine form that is less frequent in feminine contexts, may have resulted in progressive (perseverative) associations.

3. In palaeographical terms, the ν standing at the end of τὸν can easily be misread as υ, especially after the word θεοτόκου. (The original document that was probably destroyed by fire<sup>25</sup> is unavailable, but the copy that we have sometimes has these two letters as hardly distinguishable.) Once the article was copied incorrectly, the unintended genitive ending -ου in μητροπολίτου must have come easily.

4. Whatever palaeographic/grammatical reasons may have applied, the mistake must have been crucially affected by the fact that the modified text

<sup>25</sup> Ottokár Székely, *A ciszterci apácák Magyarországon*, 1942, Budapest, „Élet” Irodalmi és Nyomda Rt., p. 13.



also makes sense; in addition, the expression “monastery of the metropolitan” suggests the same thing, viz. that the monastery was founded by the metropolitan.

5. Finally, the mistake may have been facilitated – if the copier looked far ahead while copying the expression at hand – by the fact that τοῦ μητροπολίτου does occur later in the text (and this time, as an attribute of *monastery*), undoubtedly correctly, in the genitive. (Since an analysis of the whole text of the diploma is beyond the scope of this paper, we just note here that this is not the only point in the text where it becomes difficult to interpret due to a mistaken case marker.)<sup>26</sup>

We are aware that assuming a copying mistake is invariably a moot point in philological work. But we wish to emphasise that, without this correction, the text is hardly interpretable grammatically, as the misinterpretations of earlier translations amply illustrate. Furthermore, this minor – and grammatically motivated – correction does not add anything to our cultural historical knowledge: even on the basis of the text as it stands, we can claim that “the monastery of the metropolitan” is what the metropolitan has founded. The only difference is that via this correction the sentence becomes grammatically coherent and the person of the founder becomes more clearly identifiable.

Thus, the century-long debate concerning the special “archiepiscopal standing” of the monastery and the issue of why this was never mentioned again is no longer pertinent.<sup>27</sup>

6. Some issues concerning the deed of gift – especially those concerning its dating – are now placed in a new light by the fact that it was founded by a (Greek-speaking) metropolitan.

It would take us far from our topic to introduce the Byzantine–Hungarian church connections (that are obscure in many respects anyway) between the mid-10th century (the arrival of Bishop Hierotheos in Hungary) and the turn of the millennium (Saint Stephen’s coronation) in any detail.<sup>28</sup> In conclusion,

---

<sup>26</sup> Bálint Hóman, “Szent István görög oklevele”, *Századok*, 51, 1917, p. 125–132.

<sup>27</sup> Gy. Czebe, *A veszprémvölgyi oklevél görög szövege*, op. cit., p. 17; J. Darkó, “A veszprémi apácamonostor alapító-levelének 1109-i másolatáról”, art. cit., p. 343; Gy. Györffy, *István király és műve*, op. cit., p. 321; András Fülöp – András Koppány, “A veszprémvölgyi apácamonostor régészeti kutatása (1998–2002)”, *Műemlékvédelmi Szemle*, 12/1, 2002, p. 7; L. Holler, “Az 1109. évi veszprémvölgyi ítéletével néhány alapkérdéséről”, art. cit., p. 62–64; (etc.).

<sup>28</sup> For the details, see: R. Szentgyörgyi, “A veszprémvölgyi monostor görög nyelvű adománylevele – legelső hazai nyelvmemlékünk?”, art. cit., p. 385–393; and the literature cited there.

let us simply summarise the possible consequences of our conclusion here; those consequences require further investigations, to be sure.

With respect to the Greek-speaking metropolitan of the Abbey of Veszprém Valley who founded a Byzantine Greek nuns' monastery, "it would be unlikely to think of the Archbishop of Esztergom".<sup>29</sup>

It is also difficult to imagine that after the foundation (1001) of the first Western archdiocese (Esztergom), a Greek metropolitan – wherever his seat might be – should found a monastery in Veszprém. (Veszprém belonged to the Esztergom see from that time onwards.) Thus, we are entitled to assume that the deed of gift of the Veszprém Valley nuns (associated with the foundation of their monastery) most probably dates from before 1001.

All that makes us conclude that there must have been a Byzantine church organisation in the territory of (at least part of) Hungary before Saint Stephen started his work of church organisation. The traditional belief of ecclesiastic historians is that "the successful activity of proselytisation [after Hierotheos] (...) did not involve institutionalised presence and especially not that of a Hungarian hierarchy as part of the Byzantine imperial church".<sup>30</sup> Note that following the Kiev mission not much later, the whole church organisation of Kiev was established in less than half a century.<sup>31</sup> In view of that parallel alone, it is hard to imagine that a Byzantine church organising activity similar to that in Kiev would not even have begun in this country.

Recent research made it clear that, testified by as many as three Byzantine sources, there existed an Orthodox archdiocese belonging under the Constantinople patriarchate in 11th-century Hungary.<sup>32</sup> The exact date of the organisation of that metropoly of Eastern rite is unknown, but its establishment could hardly happen in parallel with that of the Western church organisation. Especially in view of the fact that there was no territorial overlap between the Eastern and Western church authorities until 1215, the Fourth Council of the Lateran, this is quite impossible in terms of the canon law of both churches (*pro forma*, this was not even two separate churches until

<sup>29</sup> István Baán, "Turkia metropolíája". Kísérlet a Szent István kori magyarországi ortodox egyházszervezet rekonstrukciójára", In: Imre H. Tóth (ed.), *Az ortodoxia története Magyarországon a XVIII. századig*, 1995, Szeged, JATE Szlav Tanszéke, p. 21.

<sup>30</sup> Cf. e.g. József Török, "A magyar egyházmegyek alakulása az ezer év alatt", In: Pál Cséfalvay – Maria Antonietta De Angelis (eds.), *A magyar kereszténység ezer éve*, 2001, Budapest, Magyar Katolikus Püspöki Konferencia, p. 176.

<sup>31</sup> I. Baán, "Turkia metropolíája", art. cit. p. 20.

<sup>32</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 19.

1055).<sup>33</sup> (It cannot be excluded that the metropolity at hand was the predecessor of the – multiply problematic – Kalocsa-Bács archdiocese that had two seats but was always governed by one archbishop.<sup>34</sup>)

A more extensive exploration of early Byzantine-Hungarian connections involves many future tasks for researchers of the period. Nevertheless, this esteemed historical and linguistic historical document of the foundation of an early Byzantine nuns' monastery by a Greek metropolitan in Hungary should be seen as a highly important source.

---

<sup>33</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 22.

<sup>34</sup> Cf. I. Baán, "„Turkia metropolíája”, art. cit., p. 19; Andor Lakatos, *Kalocsa, az érseki város*, 2010. <http://archivum.asztrik.hu/?q=oldal/kalocsa-az-erseki-varos-eloadas-2010> (2014. 08. 02.); R. Szentgyörgyi, "A veszprémvölgyi monostor görög nyelvű adománylevele – legelső hazai nyelvemlékünk?", art. cit., p. 385-386.